



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,941	10/22/2003	Eric L. Solberg	021756-021410US	6302
51206 7590 08/04/2009 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER				
ANDERSON, JOHN A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3696				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,941

Applicant(s)

SOLBERG ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN A. ANDERSON

Art Unit

3696

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12, 13, 15-17, 44-52 and 54-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12, 13, 15-17, 44-52 and 54-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/26/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In the amendment filed 05/26/2009, the following has occurred: claims 1,12,and 44 and 51 have been amended, claims 14 and 53 have been cancelled. Claims 1-7,12-13,15-17,44-52,54-56 are pending and are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement dated 05/26/2009 has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3,7,12-13,15-17,44-46 and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker J.S.(PGPub 2006/0122881) and in view of Chao (PGPub 2002/0169678).
4. As regards claims 1, 12, 44 and 51, Walker J.S discloses a transaction filtering system for allocating transactions among a plurality of business objects, the system comprising:
- storage configured to store generated allocation rules and to store transaction data associated with a plurality of transactions, each generated allocation rule being associated with at least one of the plurality of business objects [0488]
 - each generated allocation rule being generated by combining a first predefined rule of a node of a hierarchical data structure with a second predefined rule inherited from a parent node, the first predefined rule characterizing a member of the at least one of the plurality of business objects;[0433]
 - a query engine configured to query the transaction data using the generated allocation rules; and [0510]
 - wherein each generated allocation rule determines if a business object is entitled to an allocation from a particular transaction.[0447]
- Walker J.S does not disclose an allocation manager configured to make one or more attempts to allocate a member of the plurality of transactions among the plurality of business objects

Chao discloses an allocation manager configured to make one or more attempts to allocate a member of the plurality of transactions among the plurality of business objects. [0072]

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Chao in the device of Walker J.S. The motivation would have been to define and restrict user access and usage.

5. As regards claims 2,45 and 52 , Walker J.S does not disclose wherein a member of the plurality of transactions is a sale and the query engine is configured to determine commission allocation.

Chao discloses wherein a member of the plurality of transactions is a sale and the query engine is configured to determine commission allocation.[0007]

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Chao in the device of Walker J.S. The motivation would have been to create an added incentive to boost sales.

6. As regards claims 3 and 46 , Walker J.S discloses wherein a member of the plurality of transactions is a purchase and the query engine is configured to determine cost allocation.[0192]

7. As regards claims 7 and 50 , Walker J.S does not disclose wherein a second

attempt at allocating the member of the plurality of transactions includes identifying a business object configured to manually determine the allocation. Chao discloses wherein a second attempt at allocating the member of the plurality of transactions includes identifying a business object configured to manually determine the allocation.[0015]

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Chao in the device of Walker J.S .The motivation would have been to have a capability for error correction.

8. As regards claim 13 , Walker J.S does not disclose, wherein the hierarchical data structure is configured to represent relationships between business objects in a sales organization.

Chao discloses wherein the hierarchical data structure is configured to represent relationships between business objects in a sales organization.[0007]

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Chao in the device of Walker J.S .The motivation would have been to provide sales representatives with an incentive to sell as much as possible.

9. As regards claim 15 , Walker J.S does not disclose wherein the first generated allocation rule is produced by traversing the hierarchical data structure.
- Chao discloses wherein the first generated allocation rule is produced by traversing the hierarchical data structure.[0009]

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Chao in the device of Walker J.S .The motivation would have been to extract sales data from the hierarchical structure.

10. As regards claim 16 , Walker J.S does not disclose wherein the second query is configured to identify a business object having a management role with respect to a node of the hierarchical data structure.
- Chao discloses wherein the second query is configured to identify a business object having a management role with respect to a node of the hierarchical data structure.[0126]

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Chao in the device of Walker J.S .The motivation would have been to assist in consistent creation and editing of roles.

11. As regards claim 17 , Walker J.S does not disclose further including a transaction source configured to generate the transaction data.

Chao discloses further including a transaction source configured to generate the transaction data.[0026]

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Chao in the device of Walker J.S. The motivation would have been to extract the relevant information.

12. Claims 4-6, 47-49 and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker J.S.(PGPub 2006/0122881) and in view of Chao (PGPub 2002/0169678) and in further view of Chang D (PGPub 2007/0226027).
13. As regards claims 4,47 and 54 , Walker J.S does not disclose, wherein a member of the plurality of transactions is unallocated after a first attempt at allocation.

Chang D discloses wherein a member of the plurality of transactions is unallocated after a first attempt at allocation.[0089]

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Chang D in the device of Walker J.S. The motivation would have been to define the transaction type.

14. As regards claims 5, 48, and 55 , Walker J.S does not disclose wherein a

member of the plurality of transactions is under-allocated after a first attempt at allocation.

Chang D discloses wherein a member of the plurality of transactions is under-allocated after a first attempt at allocation.[0089]

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Chang D in the device of Walker J.S. The motivation would have been to define the transaction type.

15. As regards claims 6,49 and 56 , Walker J.S does not disclose wherein a member of the plurality of transactions is over-allocated after a first attempt at allocation. Chang D discloses wherein a member of the plurality of transactions is over-allocated after a first attempt at allocation.[0088]

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Chang D in the device of Walker J.S. The motivation would have been to define the transaction type.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7,12-13,15-17,44-52,54-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN A. ANDERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3327. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 to 5:00 Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dixon can be reached on 571-272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John A Anderson/

John A Anderson

Application/Control Number: 10/691,941

Page 10

Art Unit: 3696

Examiner, Art Unit 3696

Examiner

Art Unit 3696

/J. A. A./

Examiner, Art Unit 3696 07/22/2009

/Daniel S Felten/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696